



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

M

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/220,284 12/23/98 WRIGHT

G JWRIGHT.008C

020995 LM02/0204
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
620 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE
SIXTEENTH FLOOR
NEWPORT BEACH CA 92660

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2771
DATE MAILED:

4
02/04/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

See attached PTO-892 and references

Thomas G. Black
THOMAS G. BLACK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/220,284

Applicant(s)
Wright

Examiner
Charles Rones

Group Art Unit
2771

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thomas Black

(3) _____

(2) John Carson

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jan 14, 2000

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 30

Identification of prior art discussed:

Reisman and Lotus' e Mail

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner pointed out that claim 1 had an ambiguity in claim 1 that led to the current interpretation of the claim by Examiner Rones. The attorney agreed to correct this. The attorney agreed to argue Reisman in respect to the amended claim. Examiner agreed to find the Lotus Mail reference and provide it to applicant rather than rely on official Notice.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Thomas G. Black
THOMAS G. BLACK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700